



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,585	02/06/2002	Toshihisa Nakamura	121.1021	5802
21171 7590 12/07/2007 STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER LIN, KENNY S	
			ART UNIT 2152	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/07/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/066,585

Applicant(s)

NAKAMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Kenny Lin

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.



### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

#### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/11/2007 has been entered.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scherpbier et al (Scherpbier), US 5,944,791.
5. Scherpbier was cited in the previous office action as a reference not relied upon in rejection.

6. As per claim 1, Scherpbier taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method, comprising:

- a. Sending a request from a first device to a management device to remotely operate a second device (col.3, lines 50-55, col.4, lines 32-35);
- b. Disabling, by the management device, user operation of the second device (col.5, lines 1-3) and establishing a remote operation relationship between the first device as a master device and the second device as a slave device in a master-slave communication established between the first device and the second device (col.1, lines 52-56, col.5, lines 36-67, col.6, lines 1-7);
- c. Sending another request from the first device to the management device to obtain a web page (col.4, lines 50-60);
- d. Obtaining the web page by the management device from a web server and sending the web page to the first device and to the second device that is in a group relationship with the first device (col.5, lines 36-67, col.6, lines 1-7); and
- e. Displaying the web page on a display of the first device and the second device, where the second device responds to commands of the first device operating as the master device (col.6, lines 1-7).

7. Scherpbier did not specifically teach that the first device and the second device are switchably operable as the master device and the slave device responsive to a user request. However, Scherpbier taught that the pilot computer and passenger computer can be any suitable user computers (col.4, lines 1-6) and only needs to download pilot and passenger applets to

function as pilot or passenger computer (col.1, lines 62-67, col.2, lines 1-5, col.4, lines 30-49, col.5, lines 5-20). Accordingly, if a user desires to present a web page to both pilot and passenger computers, the user initiates the flight request to the control computer and establish the user's computer as the pilot computer (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Scherpbier and enables each device to be able to function as a master device or a slave device in response to a user request to act as the master (initiate flight request) or the slave (board flight).

8. As per claim 2, Scherpbier taught the invention substantially as claimed including a remote operation system, comprising:

- a. A management device (control computer 12);
- b. A first device connected to the management device via a network (pilot computer, col.3, lines 50-55: fig.1); and
- c. A second device connected to the management device via a network (passenger computer, col.3, lines 50-55: fig.1),

Wherein the first device sends a request to the management device to remotely operate the second device, the management device establishes a remote operations relationship including a master-slave communication between the first device as a master device and the second device as a slave device (col.1, lines 52-56, col.5, lines 36-67, col.6, lines 1-7); the first device sends another request to the management device to obtain a web page (col.4, lines 50-60), the management device obtains the web page from a web server and sends the web page obtained to the first device and to the second device that is in a group relationship with the first device (col.5,

lines 36-67, col.6, lines 1-7), and the first device and the second device each display the web page on a display and the second device responds to commands of the first device operating as the master device (col.6, lines 1-7).

9. Scherpbier did not specifically teach that the first device and the second device are switchably operable as the master device and the slave device responsive to a user request. However, Scherpbier taught that the pilot computer and passenger computer can be any suitable user computers (col.4, lines 1-6) and only needs to download pilot and passenger applets to function as pilot or passenger computer (col.1, lines 62-67, col.2, lines 1-5, col.4, lines 30-49, col.5, lines 5-20). Accordingly, if a user desires to present a web page to both pilot and passenger computers, the user initiates the flight request to the control computer and establish the user's computer as the pilot computer (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Scherpbier and enables each device to be able to function as a master device or a slave device in response to a user request to act as the master (initiate flight request) or the slave (board flight).

10. As per claim 3, Scherpbier taught the invention substantially as claimed including a processing apparatus, comprising

- a. A signal receiving unit receiving a request from a first control unit (col.4, lines 53-60);
- b. An execution unit executing processing in response to the request and generating processing results (col.4, lines 60-67) and

- c. A remote operation control unit transmitting the processing results to the first control unit and to the second control unit different from the first control unit that is in a group relationship with the first control unit responsive to the request (col.5, lines 36-67, col.6, lines 1-7), where the first control unit operates as a master device in a master-slave communication established between the first control unit and the second control unit (col.1, lines 52-56).

11. Scherpbier did not specifically teach that the first device and the second device are switchably operable as the master device and the slave device responsive to a user request. However, Scherpbier taught that the pilot computer and passenger computer can be any suitable user computers (col.4, lines 1-6) and only needs to download pilot and passenger applets to function as pilot or passenger computer (col.1, lines 62-67, col.2, lines 1-5, col.4, lines 30-49, col.5, lines 5-20). Accordingly, if a user desires to present a web page to both pilot and passenger computers, the user initiates the flight request to the control computer and establish the user's computer as the pilot computer (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Scherpbier and enables each device to be able to function as a master device or a slave device in response to a user request to act as the master (initiate flight request) or the slave (board flight).

12. As per claim 4, Scherpbier taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 3. Scherpbier further taught that the request is to remotely operate the second control unit (col.6, lines 15-19).

13. As per claim 7, Scherpbier taught the invention substantially as claimed including a management apparatus, comprising:

- a. A signal receiving unit receiving a request from a first apparatus (col.3, lines 50-55, col.4, lines 32-35);
- b. An execution unit executing processing in response to the request and generating processing results (col.4, lines 60-67); and
- c. A remote operation control unit transmitting the processing results to the first apparatus and to a second apparatus different from the first apparatus and is in a group relationship with the first apparatus responsive to the request, where the first apparatus operates as a master in a master-slave communication established between the first apparatus and the second apparatus (col.1, lines 52-56, col.5, lines 36-67, col.6, lines 1-7).

14. Scherpbier did not specifically teach that the first device and the second device are switchably operable as the master device and the slave device responsive to a user request. However, Scherpbier taught that the pilot computer and passenger computer can be any suitable user computers (col.4, lines 1-6) and only needs to download pilot and passenger applets to function as pilot or passenger computer (col.1, lines 62-67, col.2, lines 1-5, col.4, lines 30-49, col.5, lines 5-20). Accordingly, if a user desires to present a web page to both pilot and passenger computers, the user initiates the flight request to the control computer and establish the user's computer as the pilot computer (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Scherpbier and



enables each device to be able to function as a master device or a slave device in response to a user request to act as the master (initiate flight request) or the slave (board flight).

15. As per claim 10, Scherpbier taught the invention substantially as claimed including a computer system, comprising:

- a. A first apparatus (pilot computer, col.3, lines 50-55: fig.1);
- b. A management apparatus receiving processing requests from the first apparatus, executing processing in response to the processing requests, and generating processing results (control computer 12, col.3, lines 50-55, col.4, lines 32-35, 60-67); and
- c. A second apparatus (passenger computer, col.3, lines 50-55: fig.1) remotely operated by the first apparatus and is in a group relationship with the first apparatus (col.1, lines 52-56, col.6, lines 15-19), wherein the management apparatus simultaneously transmits the processing results to the first apparatus and to the second apparatus, and the second apparatus executing processing in response to the processing results, where the first apparatus operates as a master in a master-slave communication established between the first apparatus and the second apparatus (abstract, col.1, lines 52-56, col.5, lines 36-67, col.6, lines 1-7).

16. Scherpbier did not specifically teach that the first apparatus and the second apparatus are switchably operable as the master and the slave responsive to a user request. However, Scherpbier taught that the pilot computer and passenger computer can be any suitable user

computers (col.4, lines 1-6) and only needs to download pilot and passenger applets to function as pilot or passenger computer (col.1, lines 62-67, col.2, lines 1-5, col.4, lines 30-49, col.5, lines 5-20). Accordingly, if a user desires to present a web page to both pilot and passenger computers, the user initiates the flight request to the control computer and establish the user's computer as the pilot computer (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Scherpbier and enables each device to be able to function as a master device or a slave device in response to a user request to act as the master (initiate flight request) or the slave (board flight).

17. As per claim 11, Scherpbier taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 10. Scherpbier did not specifically teach that the user operation of the second apparatus is disabled when the second apparatus is being remotely operated (col.5, lines 1-3).

18. As per claims 13 and 17-18, Scherpbier taught the invention substantially as claimed including a remote operation method and process, comprising:

- a. Receiving a processing request from a first control unit operating as a master in a master-slave communication established between the first control unit and a second control unit (col.3, lines 50-55, col.4, lines 32-35, 50-67), executing processing in response to the request and generating processing results (col.5, lines 36-67), and transmitting the processing results to the first control unit and to the second control unit that is different from the first control unit and is in a group relationship with the first control unit responsive to the request (col.6, lines 1-7).

19. Scherpbier did not specifically teach that the first control unit and the second control unit are switchably operable as the master device and the slave device responsive to a user request. However, Scherpbier taught that the pilot computer and passenger computer can be any suitable user computers (col.4, lines 1-6) and only needs to download pilot and passenger applets to function as pilot or passenger computer (col.1, lines 62-67, col.2, lines 1-5, col.4, lines 30-49, col.5, lines 5-20). Accordingly, if a user desires to present a web page to both pilot and passenger computers, the user initiates the flight request to the control computer and establish the user's computer as the pilot computer (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Scherpbier and enables each device to be able to function as a master device or a slave device in response to a user request to act as the master (initiate flight request) or the slave (board flight).

20. As per claims 5, 8 and 14, Scherpbier taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 3, 7 and 13. Scherpbier further taught that the second control unit comprises a plurality of control units (col.3, lines 62-65, col.7, lines 31-34).

21. As per claims 6, 9, 12 and 15, Scherpbier taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 3, 7, 10 and 13. Scherpbier further taught that the request is a request to obtain a web page, the execution unit obtains the web page, and the remote operation control unit simultaneously transmits the web page obtained by the execution unit to the first control unit and to the second control unit (col.5, lines 36-67, col.6, lines 1-7).

22. As per claim 16, Scherpbier taught the invention substantially as claimed including a remote operation method comprising:

- a. Receiving a processing request from a first apparatus connected to a second apparatus by a network (col.3, lines 50-55, col.4, lines 32-35);
- b. Executing processing in response to the processing request and generating processing results (col.4, lines 50-67); and
- c. Transmitting the processing results to the first apparatus and to the second apparatus that is in a group relationship with the first apparatus based on the processing request (col.5, lines 36-67, col.6, lines 1-7), where the first apparatus operates as a master in a master-slave communication established between the first apparatus and the second apparatus (col.1, lines 52-56).

23. Scherpbier did not specifically teach that the first apparatus and the second apparatus are switchably operable as the master device and the slave device responsive to a user request. However, Scherpbier taught that the pilot computer and passenger computer can be any suitable user computers (col.4, lines 1-6) and only needs to download pilot and passenger applets to function as pilot or passenger computer (col.1, lines 62-67, col.2, lines 1-5, col.4, lines 30-49, col.5, lines 5-20). Accordingly, if a user desires to present a web page to both pilot and passenger computers, the user initiates the flight request to the control computer and establish the user's computer as the pilot computer (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Scherpbier and

enables each device to be able to function as a master device or a slave device in response to a user request to act as the master (initiate flight request) or the slave (board flight).

24. As per claim 19, Scherpbier taught the invention substantially as claimed including a remote operation method of controlling devices, comprising:

- a. Identifying a group affiliation of a first device requesting a connection (col.5, lines 1-20, boarding flight using flight number);
- b. Transmitting a request of the first device to a second device having the group affiliation of the first device to obtain information on behalf of the first device (col.5, lines 1-20, 36-67, col.6, lines 1-7), the first device operating in a master-slave communication established between the first device and the second device (col.1, lines 52-56); and
- c. Establishing a remote operation between the second device operating as a master client and the first device operating as a slave client (abstract, col.1, lines 52-56, col.5, lines 36-67, col.6, lines 1-7) by disabling a user operation with respect to the first device (col.5, lines 1-3).

25. Scherpbier did not specifically teach that the first device and the second device are switchably operable as the master device and the slave device responsive to a user request. However, Scherpbier taught that the pilot computer and passenger computer can be any suitable user computers (col.4, lines 1-6) and only needs to download pilot and passenger applets to function as pilot or passenger computer (col.1, lines 62-67, col.2, lines 1-5, col.4, lines 30-49,

col.5, lines 5-20). Accordingly, if a user desires to present a web page to both pilot and passenger computers, the user initiates the flight request to the control computer and establish the user's computer as the pilot computer (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Scherpbier and enables each device to be able to function as a master device or a slave device in response to a user request to act as the master (initiate flight request) or the slave (board flight).

26. As per claim 20, Scherpbier taught the invention substantially as claimed including a remote operation method of controlling devices, comprising:

- a. Receiving a request from a first device to remotely operate a second device (col.3, lines 50-55, col.4, lines 32-35);
- b. Identifying a group relationship of the first device and the second device, said group relationship indicating whether the first device and the second device are operating as a master device or a slave device in a master-slave communication (col.1, lines 52-56, col.5, lines 1-20, 36-67, col.6, lines 1-7);
- c. Receiving a request to receive web page content from the first device identified as the master device (col.4, lines 50-60); and
- d. Transmitting the web page content to both the first device and the second device in response to said request from the first device (col.1, lines 52-56, col.5, lines 36-67, col.6, lines 1-7).

27. Scherpbier did not specifically teach that the first device and the second device are switchably operable as the master device and the slave device responsive to a user request. However, Scherpbier taught that the pilot computer and passenger computer can be any suitable user computers (col.4, lines 1-6) and only needs to download pilot and passenger applets to function as pilot or passenger computer (col.1, lines 62-67, col.2, lines 1-5, col.4, lines 30-49, col.5, lines 5-20). Accordingly, if a user desires to present a web page to both pilot and passenger computers, the user initiates the flight request to the control computer and establish the user's computer as the pilot computer (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Scherpbier and enables each device to be able to function as a master device or a slave device in response to a user request to act as the master (initiate flight request) or the slave (board flight).

### ***Response to Arguments***

28. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

29. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tue.-Fri. and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ksl  
December 6, 2007

